

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present Application. Claims 1, 13-15, 17, 19-21, 24-27, and 34-42 were pending. Claims 1, 14, 15, 19-21, 24, 25, and 27 have been amended. Claims 17 and 37-39 have been canceled. Claims 1, 13-15, 19-21, 24-27, 34-36, 41, and 42 are pending and are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 13-15, 17, 19-21, 24-27, and 34-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hawkins *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,493,464, in view of Forcier, U.S. Patent No. 6,499,043. Claims 17 and 37-39 have been canceled thereby rendering rejection thereof moot.

Each of independent claims 1, 14, and 27 includes an element, whereby a same symbol is assigned as a shorthand representation to two or more of a text expansion, a function, and a program. For example, the symbol “kbd” might be assigned to both the text expansion “keyboard,” as well as, launching of a word-processor program. The Office Action states that Hawkins fails to describe that a user input is associated with more than one function, and instead relies on Forcier to describe this element of independent claims 1, 14, and 27. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office Action’s interpretation of Forcier in this manner and submit that Applicants did not discover any portion of Forcier that describes that a same symbol is associated with two or more of a text, a function, and a program.

In contrast to independent claims 1, 14, and 27, Forcier describes a two-step gesture method that is usable to invoke an editing function. *See Forcier* at col. 4, lines 45-50. For example, a user makes an initial mode prompt, which switches the system into an editing mode, after which a subsequent stylus movement is interpreted as an editing command. Forcier

states that “the two-step gesture method...allows use of similar gestures for different functions,” which merely implies that similar (not same) gestures might be used for shorthand text and function initiation. However, Forcier fails to describe that the exact same gesture is assigned to be used as shorthand for each of a text extension, a function, and a program – an element that is required by claims 1, 14, and 27. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Forcier fails to describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of claims 1, 14, and 27.

Moreover, claim 1 requires that when an input is a sole entry, a function is carried out (as opposed to a text extension). This is in direct contrast to Forcier, which states that the editing function is only invoked with the input is accompanied by a transitory gesture prompt, i.e., Forcier describes that in order to invoke the editing function, the user input cannot be a sole entry but instead must be a two-step interactive approach in which multiple entries are made. Similar to claim 1, claim 27 requires that upon determining that the user input is a sole entry, the program is launched.

As such, Applicants did not discover any portion of the cited references that describe either (1) using an exact same symbol as a shorthand representation of each of a text extension, a function, and a program, and (2) upon determining that a user input is a sole entry, executing a function or launching a program. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to describe or teach, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of independent claims 1, 14, and 27, and that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103 should be withdrawn. Claims 1, 14, and 27 are believed to be in condition to be allowed, and such favorable action is respectfully requested.

If an independent claim is nonobvious, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Claims 13, 15, 19-21, 24-26, 34-36, 41,

and 42 are believed to be patentable based on their dependence from one of claims 1, 14, and 27.

As such, claims 13, 15, 19-21, 24-26, 34-36, 41, and 42 are believed to be in condition for allowance and such favorable action is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 1, 13-15, 19-21, 24-27, 34-36, 41, and 42 are now in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of the claims. If any issues remain that would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned – 816-474-6550 or adobrien@shb.com (such communication via email is herein expressly granted) – to resolve the same. It is believed that no fee is due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required to Deposit Account No. 19-2112.

Respectfully submitted,

/ANDREW D. O'BRIEN/

Andrew D. O'Brien
Reg. No. 57,064

ADO/tl
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Blvd.
Kansas City, MO 64108-2613
816-474-6550